

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

We can look at the instance of the news programs following OJ Simpson's car and the following benge covering of the trial as just one example. It was good for ratings however it had nothing to do with my personal interest. The news time would have been better spent on important issues like the educational system etc. The OJ news blitz is just one instance we can look at the news every day and find non-important stories that are getting airplay over meaningful news.

I'm also concerned that the media in general is slanted toward corporate interest over personal interests (my personal interests). Our country is in debt and we have a large trade deficit (jobs seem to be our only robust export). This may be good for corporate America (in the short run), however it's probably not good for me. Of course important issues like these seldom get reported on, even during elections. The elections are not getting indept coverage as well.

Consolidating the media into even fewer hands will only make thing worse than they already are for obvious reasons. I'm really concerned that our country is moving toward a plutacracy, if it hasn't already become a plutacracy.

Sincerely,

Chester Hazlewood